

## UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 10

1200 Sixth Avenue Seattle, Washington 98101

July 12, 1994

Reply to

Attn of: HW-113

## MEMORANDUM

Subject: CERCLA Response Claims

Colbert Landfill, Spokane County, WA

CERCLIS ID # WAD980514541

To:

John Maggio, Coordinating Official

OERR, HSCD (5203 G)

From:

Neil E. Thompson, RPM, Superfund Branch, HWD MG

This is the preliminary review and recommendation for the CERCLA Response Claim submitted for the Colbert Landfill (WAD980514541) by Spokane County on December 22, 1993. The claim is for work performed for the planning and testing of the pilot treatment system for which a final Engineering Report was submitted to EPA and approved.

EPA made no modifications to the Scope of Work (SOW) or the Preauthorization Decision Document (PDD) that were part of the Consent Decree. The response actions made in this claim were part of the SOW and PDD.

The site identification (ID) number stated in the Response Claim at the end of the first paragraph of page one (letter to Neil Thompson, dated December 22, 1993) is not the CERCLIS ID number that is used by EPA to uniquely identify the site. The CERCLIS ID number is WAD980514541.

Spokane County has not used any money from the Colbert Trust Account for work performed during this claim period. The county is only now asking for release of money for remedial actions. The Washington Department of Ecology is the releasing official for money from the Colbert Trust Account (not EPA).

Also there is no language in the Consent Decree or PDD that limits the county from utilizing state money as part of their CERCLA Response Claim for money spent on the project. Therefore the county could receive state grant money towards the project and the grant amount could be included in the claim for EPA



reimbursement under the CERCLA Response Claim. For this Phase I claim, no state money has been included in the Response Claim for which the county is seeking a percentage reimbursement.

The site has been in compliance with the Consent Decree throughout. No violations have been recorded by EPA or the state. EPA has been paid for annual oversight costs when billed by EPA. As far as I can determine, Spokane County, a PRP has completed the work for this Phase I CERCLA Response Claim.

If you have any questions or wish to request additional information, please contact me at (206) 553-7177, or FAX (206) 553-0124.

Attachment: RPM Worksheet for Preliminary Review

cc: Cyndy Mackey, ORC, Region 10

## PRELIMINARY REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION ON PERFECTION: WORKSHEET FOR THE REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGER

	• •	im #:		
	Scheduled Completion Date: PDI	D#:		
PRELIMINARY RI	EVIĒW* (čheck one)	Yes	No	N/A
Overall Questions:	s: Was the work completed?			
	Was the work done satisfactorily?	~		
	Has adequate supporting documentation been provided?			
Preauthorized Phase	ases: Did the activities conducted constitute a preauthorized phase or operable unit of the response action? (Part III.A)			
	Was the claim for the appropriate preauthorized phase or operable unit? (Part III.C)	1		
	Was an explanation provided if the preauthorized phase or operable unit was not completed on schedule? (Part III.D)			1
Response Action:	<ul> <li>Were the discussion and documentation of whether the claimant adhered to each term and condition of the PDD adequate? (Parts IV and IV.E)</li> </ul>	/.A		
	Was there adequate documentation (i.e., number and date) of EPA approval for any modifications to the PDD? (Part IV.B)			/
	Do the response activities differ from the PDD (if no EPA approval w requested or given to modify the PDD)? (Part IV.B)	as	1	
	Was adequate evidence provided on whether the response action wormpleted in accordance with the SOW and Work Plans (i.e., within scope; routine or customary)? (Part IV.C)	as /		
·	Was the explanation of how and why the response action differs from the SOW and Work Plans adequate? (Part IV.D)	n		/
Oversight Official	Did the Oversight Official indicate any activity that will directly or indirectly affect the cost of the response action? (Are the change orders within the scope of the PDD?)			1
STATUS OF REVI	EW (check appropriate milestone and provide date)		<u> </u>	
ā	Review Initiated			
ū	Recommendation To Return Claim			
ā	Revised Claim Received			
Ö	Request For Additional Information			
9	Additional Information Received			
ā	Determine If Information Is Adequate			
Ò	Review Completed			
<u> </u>	Recommendation For Perfection			

\*Attach adequate supporting documentation

394